REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Counsel for assignce has received the office communication mailed March 14, 2011. In that action claims 1-3, 26, 28 and 30 were presented for examination. All claims were rejected based upon various combinations of references as enumerated in the action. On page 15 of the action, however, the Examiner indicated that an amendment reciting specific aspects of the peripheral junction region would overcome the rejections.

By this response counsel has introduced into claim 1 the two limitations suggested by the Examiner. In particular, counsel has amended independent claim 1 to require that the peripheral junction region be completely surrounded by the isolation diffusion region. Support for this limitation can be found, for example, in Figures 3 through 8 of the application. In addition, counsel has amended independent claim 1 to require that the peripheral junction region be in direct contact with the oxide layer. Support for this limitation is found in the same figures.

With this response counsel also submits new claims 31-36. Independent claim 31 corresponds closely to claim 1 as discussed above. In particular, new claim 31 includes a limitation: "a peripheral junction region of second conductivity type disposed adjacent the upper surface and formed at least partly within the isolation diffusion region, the isolation region completely surrounding the peripheral junction region at the periphery of the substrate." The limitation is also present that the layer of silicon dioxide disposed over the upper surface of the substrate overly the peripheral junction region. All other limitations of claim 1 are present in new claim 31, but new claim 31 uses slightly revise wording to place it in better form.

Appl. No. 10/650,451 Amdt. dated June 14, 2011 Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure Examining Group 2811

Claims 32-36 are dependent claims directed to particular features of the cathode and anode, the conductivity types of the various regions, and, the conductivity types of the regions beneath the cathode as illustrated in Figures 3 and 4. These claims are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 31.

If the Examiner has questions or would like to discuss this response please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Colwell/

Robert C. Colwell Reg. No. 27,431

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 650-326-2400 Fax: 415-576-0300 RCC:wmg 83837045 vi